### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## **PCT**

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 13902.27	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/CA2006/000086	International filing date (day/month/year) 24 January 2006 (24.01.2006)	Priority date (day/month/year) 24 January 2005 (24.01.2005)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant OZ COMMUNICATIONS INC.		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis. 1(a).				
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.				
	In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.				
3.	. This report contains indications relating to the following items:				
	Box No. I	Basis of the report			
	Box No. II	Priority	-		
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinapplicability	nion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial		
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention			
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited			
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the inter	rnational application		
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on th	e international application		
4.	4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).				
			Date of issuance of this report 24 July 2007 (24.07.2007)		
	The International Bureau of WIPO  Authorized officer				
	34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  Athina Nickitas-Etienne				
Facsin	Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70 e-mail: pt04.pct@wipo.int				

Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To: GOUDREAU GAGE DUBUC Tour de la Bourse Bureau 3400 C.P. 242, 800 Place-Victoria MONTREAL, Quebec Canada, H4Z 1E9		PCT  WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  (PCT Rule 43bis.1)	
		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	1 May 2006 (01-05-2006)
Applicant's or agent's file reference HM/13902.27		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/CA2006/000086	International filing date ( 24 January 2006 (24-0		
International Patent Classification (IPC IPC: H04L 12/66 (2006.01), H04Q 7/			,
Applicant OZ COMMUNICATIONS EX	ΓAL		
1. This opinion contains indications rel	ating to the following items	3:	
[X] Box No. I Basis of the opinion		,	
[ ] Box No. II Priority			
[ ] Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion wi		th regard to novelty, in	ventive step and industrial applicability
[ ] Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention			
[X] Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis. 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement			
[ ] Box No. VI Certain documents cited			
[ ] Box No. VII Certa	in defects in the internation	al application	•
[X] Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the cho has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.		ity other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA	
	ore the expiration of 3 months fro		wited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, orm PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/22	20.		•
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT	/ISA/220.	_	<u>.                                    </u>
Name and mailing address of the ISA/CA Canadian Intellectual Property Office Place du Portage I, C114 - 1st Floor, Box PCT 50 Victoria Street Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0C9 Facsimile No.: 001(819)953-2476  Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer  Arthur Smith (819) 953-1360			

Во	x N	o. I	Basis of this opinion	
1.	Wit	th re	egard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:	
	[X	]	the international application in the language in which it was filed	
	1	-	a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a	
		1	translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).	
2.			egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed on, this opinion has been established on the basis of:	
	a.	type	of material	
		[	] a sequence listing	
		[	] table(s) related to the sequence listing	
	<b>b</b> .	form	nat of material	
		[	] on paper	
		[	] in electronic form	
	<b>c</b> . 1	time	e of filing/furnishing	
		[	] contained in the international application as filed.	
		[	] filed together with the international application in electronic form	
		[	] furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3	[	-	in addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has	
•			peen filed or furnished, the required statement that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.	1
4.	Ado	ditic	onal comments:	
			·	
			·	

International application No. PCT/CA2006/000086

YES

NO

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement 1. Statement YES Novelty (N) Claims <u>1-37</u> NO Claims None

> Claims None

1-37

Claims

NO Claims 1-37 YES

Claims None

### 2. Citations and explanations:

Inventive step (IS)

- 1.0 The following document is referred to in this communication:
  - US 2004/0249892 A1

Industrial applicability (IA)

1.1 D1 is considered to form the closest prior art. D1 describes methods and devices for improved security in the transmission over an air interface of multi-content e-mail from an e-mail server to a mobile client, including generation of an e-mail descriptor file by the e-mail server comprising descriptions of the content parts of a larger, possibly multi-content, e-mail including parts stored remotely. The descriptor file is transmitted to the mobile client as a separate e-mail. After receiving the descriptor file, the mobile client analyzes the contents and requests download of only those parts of the larger e-mail that can be efficiently transferred over the air interface, and that can be processed by the mobile client considering limitations to its processing capacity.

### Novelty

2.0 The common elements of independent claims 1, 10, 15, 25, and 35 include compiling, by a gateway, e-mail related information from an e-mail server into a single, self-contained response for transmission to an e-mail client. D1 fails to teach a separate gateway and does not include steps to retrieve the e-mail information from the e-mail server. Furthermore, D1 fails to teach a stateless interface interconnected with the wireless network, a channel management function, or a logging function for logging the e-mail data traffic between a wireless mobile device and an e-mail server. Thus, claims 1-37 are considered to be novel in accordance with Article 33(2) PCT.

### **Inventive Step**

3.0 As stated above, D1 fails to teach a separate gateway and does not include steps to retrieve e-mail information from the e-mail server. D1 fails to teach the additional details of each of independent claims 1, 10, 15, 25, and 35, and, therefore, claims 1-37 are considered to have inventive step in accordance with Article 33(3) PCT.

#### **Industrial Applicability**

4.0 Wireless e-mail systems find use in computer communication systems and, thus, claims 1-37 are industrially applicable in accordance with Article 33(4) PCT.

	EVIERIVATIONAL SEARCHEVO AUTHORITI	PC1/CA2006/000086			
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application					
	The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:				
Description-Related Objections  The description does not comply with PCT Article 5. Statements in an application, such as found on page 2, lines 8 and 20, which incorporate by reference any other document do not fully describe the invention. The description shall be complete in and of itself. A person skilled in the art should be able to understand the patent specification without reference to any other document.					
,					
		·			
	•				
	·.				

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

GOUDREAU GAGE DUBUC Tour de la Bourse Bureau 3400 C.P. 242, 800 Place-Victoria MONTREAL, Quebec Canada, H4Z 1E9		PCT  WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  (PCT Rule 43bis.1)		
	·		Date of mailing 1 May 2006 (01-05-2006) (day/month/year)	
	oplicant's or agent's file reference M/13902.27		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/CA2006/000086  International filing date (a 24 January 2006 (24-0))			Priority date (day/month/year) 24 January 2005 (24-01-2005)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification IPC: H04L 12/66 (2006.01), H04Q 7/22 (2006.01), H04L 12/54				
_	oplicant Z COMMUNICATIONS ET	AL		
1.	This opinion contains indications relat	ting to the following items	s:	
	[X] Box No. I Basis o	of the opinion		•
	[ ] Box No. II Priority	y	•	
	[ ] Box No. III Non-es	stablishment of opinion wi	th regard to novelty, in	ventive step and industrial applicability
	[ ] Box No. IV Lack of	f unity of invention		
[X] Box No. V  Reasoned statement under Rule applicability, citations and expla  [] Box No. VI  Certain documents cited		-	d to novelty, inventive step or industrial statement	
		documents cited		
	[ ] Box No. VII Certain	defects in the internation	al application	
[X] Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority (has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International		n will be considered to be a pplicant chooses an Author pinions of this International	ity other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA Searching Authority will not be so considered.	
		e the expiration of 3 months fro		round to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, from PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months
	For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220	ı <b>.</b>		
3.	For further details, see notes to Form PCT/Is	SA/220.		
Name and mailing address of the ISA/CA Canadian Intellectual Property Office Place du Portage I, C114 - 1st Floor, Box PCT 50 Victoria Street Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0C9 Facsimile No.: 001(819)953-2476  Date of completion 13 April 2006 (13			·	Authorized officer  Arthur Smith (819) 953-1360

Во	x N	o. 1	Basis of this opinion
1.	Wit	th r	egard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	(X	]	the international application in the language in which it was filed
	[	]	a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a
			translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2.			egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed ion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	typ	e of material
		[	] a sequence listing
		Į.	] table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	for	nat of material
		[	] on paper
		[	] in electronic form
	c.	tim	e of filing/furnishing
		[	] contained in the international application as filed.
		[	] filed together with the international application in electronic form
		[	] furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3	[	]	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has
•			been filed or furnished, the required statement that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Ado	diti	onal comments :
	•		

International application No. PCT/CA2006/000086

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement 1. Statement Novelty (N) YES Claims 1-37 Claims NO None Inventive step (IS) Claims YES 1-37 Claims None NO Industrial applicability (IA) Claims 1-37 YES Claims None NO

### 2. Citations and explanations:

Box No. V

- 1.0 The following document is referred to in this communication:
  - D1US 2004/0249892 A1
- 1.1 D1 is considered to form the closest prior art. D1 describes methods and devices for improved security in the transmission over an air interface of multi-content e-mail from an e-mail server to a mobile client, including generation of an e-mail descriptor file by the e-mail server comprising descriptions of the content parts of a larger, possibly multi-content, e-mail including parts stored remotely. The descriptor file is transmitted to the mobile client as a separate e-mail. After receiving the descriptor file, the mobile client analyzes the contents and requests download of only those parts of the larger e-mail that can be efficiently transferred over the air interface, and that can be processed by the mobile client considering limitations to its processing capacity.

#### Novelty

2.0 The common elements of independent claims 1, 10, 15, 25, and 35 include compiling, by a gateway, e-mail related information from an e-mail server into a single, self-contained response for transmission to an e-mail client. D1 fails to teach a separate gateway and does not include steps to retrieve the e-mail information from the e-mail server. Furthermore, D1 fails to teach a stateless interface interconnected with the wireless network, a channel management function, or a logging function for logging the e-mail data traffic between a wireless mobile device and an e-mail server. Thus, claims 1-37 are considered to be novel in accordance with Article 33(2) PCT.

#### **Inventive Step**

3.0 As stated above, D1 fails to teach a separate gateway and does not include steps to retrieve e-mail information from the e-mail server. D1 fails to teach the additional details of each of independent claims 1, 10, 15, 25, and 35, and, therefore, claims 1-37 are considered to have inventive step in accordance with Article 33(3) PCT.

### **Industrial Applicability**

4.0 Wireless e-mail systems find use in computer communication systems and, thus, claims 1-37 are industrially applicable in accordance with Article 33(4) PCT.

		FC1/CA2000/000080				
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application					
The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:						
Description Pol	ated Objections					
The description of incorporate by re	Description-Related Objections  The description does not comply with PCT Article 5. Statements in an application, such as found on page 2, lines 8 and 20, which incorporate by reference any other document do not fully describe the invention. The description shall be complete in and of itself. A person skilled in the art should be able to understand the patent specification without reference to any other document.					
	•					